



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,340	03/07/2001	Don M. Simpson	STL920000077US1	4769
45112	7590	12/19/2005	EXAMINER	
KUNZLER & ASSOCIATES 8 EAST BROADWAY SUITE 600 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			NGUYEN, CAM LINH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/801,340

Applicant(s)

SIMPSON ET AL.

Examiner

CamLinh Nguyen

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to amendments filed on 10/13/2005.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/13/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. Applicant's amendments to 101 rejections are acknowledged. Consequently, rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 is withdrawn.
4. Claims 1 – 22 are currently pending for further processing.

Terminal Disclaimer

5. The terminal disclaimer filed on 10/13/2005 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. Patent No. 6,813,616 B2 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Oyanagi et al (U.S. 4,815,005).

♦ As per claims 1, 13,

Oyanagi et al (U.S. 4,815,005) discloses a method for identifying objects referenced in a stream of text, comprising:

Art Unit: 2161

- Receiving an incoming stream of text comprised of words” See col. 5, lines 4 – 41. “ An incoming stream of text” corresponds to the question/query (Does CLYDE own NEST 1?) that comprises plurality of words.
 - “Consulting a semantic network to automatically identifying one or more word patterns in the incoming stream of text (“CLYDE” and “NEST 1”) with a single examination of each word” See col. 5, lines 4 - 41. Oyanagi teaches that the word patterns “CLYDE – object” or “NEST1- value” are identified. The examination is completed in one circle (col. 5, lines 11 – 13.)
 - “Referencing a known object within the semantic network, the known object identified by word pattern of the semantic network” See col. 5, lines 8 – 11, 14 – 28.
- ◆ As per claims 2, 14,
- “Loading the semantic network substantially entirely into RAM memory of a processor” See Fig. 1, element 10, col. 3, lines 44 – 46, col. 4, lines 34 – 42. Oyanagi implements the semantic network in a memory that can be accessed and executed; therefore, the “RAM” is inherent in this memory.
- ◆ As per claims 3, 6 – 8, 15, 18 – 20,
- “Dividing the stream of text into a plurality of threads and conducting the step of consulting ... word patterns”. Referring to col. 5, lines 44 – col. 6, lines 23, Oyanagi teaches that a plurality of processing are executed. At least two processes are executed in parallel (memory 14, and 20, col. 4, lines 60 – 61.)

Art Unit: 2161

While the main memory searches for the object- values, the sub memory searches attributes that are not stored in main memory (col. 4, lines 45 – 48).

♦ As per claims 4, 16,

- “Consulting a semantic network of recognized words and patterns of words in a hierarchical order moving from identified nodes to related nodes linked with the identified nodes” See Fig. 2, col. 4, lines 7 – 15.

♦ As per claims 5, 17,

- “Examining words in the stream of text in a sequential order as the words are received” See col. 2, lines 3 – 8.

♦ As per claims 9 – 11, 21 – 22,

- “Presenting the identified known objects to a user” See col. 6, lines 66 – col.7, lines 3.
- “Providing links between identified word patterns” See Fig. 2.

♦ As per claim 12,

Claim 12 is rejected based on the rejections of claims 1 – 11.

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2161

9. Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Richardson et al (U.S. 6,098,033).

♦ As per claims 1, 13,

Richardson discloses a method for identifying objects referenced in a stream of text (See col. 1, lines 57 – 59 and col. 4, lines 55 – 61), comprising:

- Receiving an incoming stream of text comprised of words” See col. 1, lines 57 – 59. “
- “Consulting a semantic network to automatically identifying one or more word patterns in the incoming stream of text with a single examination of each word” See col. 3, lines 62 – col. 4, lines 1 and col. 4, lines 15 – 20.
- “Referencing a known object within the semantic network, the known object identified by word pattern of the semantic network” See col. 2, lines 40 – 47 and 60 – 65.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 2 – 12, 14 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al (U.S. 6,098,033) in view of Oyanagi et al (U.S. 4,815,005).

♦ As per claims 2, 14,

Art Unit: 2161

Richardson does not clearly teach: “Loading the semantic network substantially entirely into RAM memory of a processor”

However, Oyanagi, on the other hand, discloses a computer system that capable identifying word pattern in text comprising a computer that capable of “Loading the semantic network substantially entirely into RAM memory of a processor” See Fig. 1, element 10, col. 3, lines 44 – 46, col. 4, lines 34 – 42. Oyanagi implements the semantic network in a memory that can be accessed and executed; therefore, the “RAM” is inherent in this memory.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Oyanagi into the invention of Richardson because the combination would provide a complete system for the user to search for an object in the database using a computer.

♦ As per claims 3, 6 – 8, 15, 18 – 20, the combination of Richardson and Oyanagi disclose:

- “Dividing the stream of text into a plurality of threads and conducting the step of consulting ... word patterns”. Referring to col. 5, lines 44 – col. 6, lines 23, Oyanagi teaches that a plurality of processing are executed. At least two processes are executed in parallel (memory 14, and 20, col. 4, lines 60 – 61.) While the main memory searches for the object- values, the sub memory searches attributes that are not stored in main memory (col. 4, lines 45 – 48).

♦ As per claims 4, 16, the combination of Richardson and Oyanagi disclose:

- “Consulting a semantic network of recognized words and patterns of words in a hierarchical order moving from identified nodes to related nodes linked with the identified nodes” See Fig. 2, col. 4, lines 7 – 15 of Oyanagi.

Art Unit: 2161

◆ As per claims 5, 17, the combination of Richardson and Oyanagi disclose:

- “Examining words in the stream of text in a sequential order as the words are received” See col. 2, lines 3 – 8 of Oyanagi.

◆ As per claims 9 – 11, 21 – 22, the combination of Richardson and Oyanagi disclose:

- “Presenting the identified known objects to a user” See col. 6, lines 66 – col.7, lines 3 of Oyanagi.
- “Providing links between identified word patterns” See Fig. 2 of Oyanagi.

◆ As per claim 12, the combination of Richardson and Oyanagi disclose:

Claim 12 is rejected based on the rejections of claims 1 – 11.

Response to Arguments

12. In further search and consideration with the Quality review panel, the Examiner and the Quality review panel decided that the arguments that Applicant made on 5/6/2004 was not persuasive. Therefore, the Examiner modified the rejections and sent out an Office Action as a new ground of rejection based on the modified information and a new art.

13. Applicant argues that the Oyanagi reference does not teach searching the semantic network with each word only once. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As indicated above, the Oyanagi patent teaches that the examination is completed in one circle (col. 5, lines 11 – 13 of Oyanagi). Clearly, each word is searched once in order for the examination completed in one circle.

14. Applicant argues that the Richardson reference does not teach identifying word pattern in the incoming stream of text. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Art Unit: 2161

As seen in fig. 5, a word pattern is identified from the input words. The input words correspond to the incoming stream of text. Therefore, the pattern is identified from the incoming stream of text.

15. Applicant argues that the Richardson reference does not teach searching the semantic network with each word only once. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Richardson clearly discloses this when put the word pairs in a queue, and process these words in the order of receiving. Therefore, the Richardson reference teaches searching the semantic network with each word only once.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2161

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CamLinh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272 - 4024.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (571) 272 - 4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571 - 273 - 8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nguyen, Cam-Linh

Art Unit 2161


FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

LN